

~~ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

RELEASE IN FULL

5 October 1976

SUBJECT: Procedures for Dealing with Congressional Investigators

1. It appears that the SSCI will continue to conduct some types of investigations in addition to normal oversight activities. The new Downing committee in the House will certainly be conducting investigations, some part of which will involve CIA; it now appears that it will be operating under a short deadline and its requirements may prove very pressing.

2. It may well be that there will be recurring investigatory situations for some period to come. It certainly is true of the present, and some of the difficulties experienced recently as a result of investigative initiatives from the SSCI suggest the need for formalizing procedures for handling this kind of activity. There should be a central spot to serve as a channel into the Agency and as a control point for coordinating Agency responses. Rather than having a variety of independent Congressional investigators, giving conflicting signals and moving at all levels within the Agency, this one focal point should serve to maintain some order in Agency responses.

3. Requests by investigators should be transmitted in writing. This would force some organization in the preparation of questions and would provide a basis for refining those questions where warranted. It would stand as the formal requirement of the investigative body, and would serve as a guide for the component responsible for preparing the response.

4. Security ground rules should be established consciously, and it is appropriate for the Agency to interest itself in the procedures being observed by the investigative body. These procedures should involve physical and document security, as well as personnel security, including formal standards to be accepted by all persons having access to classified material.

04416

~~ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

5. Agency standards for controlling certain types of information should be spelled out and agreed, as well as the sanitizing procedures required for documents to be transferred out of the Agency to the investigative body. While the investigators might be granted access to Agency documents on a case-by-case basis, the rule should be that operational materials involving sources and methods are not usually available. When access is granted to the raw documents, it should be understood that special controls and review of notes must exist.

6. The following categories of information to be protected should be agreed:

- a. Names of agents and information that could identify them.
- b. Names of cooperating American sources or companies and identifying information.
- c. The details of liaison with foreign intelligence and security organizations.
- d. The details of techniques of technical collection.
- e. The details of clandestine operations.
- f. Identification of proprietaries.
- g. Policy matters requiring White House clearance.
- h. Papers originating in other agencies.
- i. Specially sensitive activities.
- j. The names of Agency employees under cover.
- k. The names of Agency employees that have not yet been revealed.
- l. Personal information on Agency employees.

~~CONFIDENTIAL - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

The general problem of "sources and methods" and classified material must be kept in mind when information is passed to Congressional committees. Special arrangements can be negotiated in special situations, but the basic material to be reported remains the same, whatever the access to it that may be agreed.

7. It should be understood that CIA has the responsibility to review reports planned for publication by the investigative body; a condition for access to classified information will be the security review by the Agency of reports proposed for publication in an unclassified form. Consideration should be given an appeal formula where there is disagreement on publication, similar to that reached with the Pike Committee.

must remember that the select committee expires with each Congress.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would mean the creation of this select committee, then, presumably, it would appear before the Committee on House Administration for funding purposes, then the organization of the committee, so that there would be relatively little time within which to do anything before the end of this Congress. Then the select committee would expire and there would be the reconstitution of the whole process all over again in the next Congress.

It just seems to me a meritorious idea—and I say this with all respect to my dear friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who will not be with us, unfortunately, next year—that this matter, if it does deserve the attention the gentleman is convinced that it does deserve, should really wait until the 95th Congress.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. If the gentleman would yield further, we have got to get started sometime, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that this thing has been put off too long. The longer we wait, the more difficult it will be to obtain whatever evidence still remains out there. If we can get it organized, get our priorities, and get our directions set in the remaining days of this Congress, then the 95th Congress can start off right away with substantial hearings.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) would yield further, I wish to point out the factual situation as I see it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

(Mr. DOWNING of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today marks the culmination for me—and others, too, I suppose—of 15 months of intensive work and efforts to try to persuade this body to reinvestigate the assassinations of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

I want to thank the Speaker; I want to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle; I want to thank the Committee on Rules for giving the House this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1540, which is sponsored by Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FAUNTROY, and me, is the refinement of a number of similar resolutions sponsored by approximately 135 Members of this body.

Two or 3 years ago—perhaps even 1 year ago—only a small fraction of us would have looked with favor upon this establishment of a select committee to re-examine the assassinations of several of our national leaders. However, today, I believe that there is overwhelming support in this House and throughout the country for an in-depth study into these traumatic events, in order to ascertain the truth, or at the very least, dispell doubts concerning them.

Most of us have reached our conclusion as to the necessity of a select committee reluctantly. However, the revelations of the last year or two have been both shocking and sobering.

Committees of both the House and the Senate have proven that much vital information was withheld from the Warren Commission. The CIA and its former Director, Allen Dulles, pointedly withheld all information relating to the multiple plots, which the U.S. Government launched, in an effort to assassinate Fidel and Raul Castro. To underline the importance of this conscious effort to deceive, we have the recent violent and unexplained murders of Sam Giancana and John Roselli, the two Mafia chiefs who were recruited by the CIA for the assassination plots against the Cuban leaders, which I think is deplorable.

A subcommittee of the House, chaired by our colleague from California, Mr. EDWARDS, has shown how a threatening note sent by Lee Harvey Oswald to an FBI agent, shortly before President Kennedy's murder, was torn up and flushed down a toilet rather than delivered to the Warren Commission.

We know that the original autopsy notes of the chief surgeon in President Kennedy's autopsy were burned in the doctor's recreation-room fireplace.

We know that Jack Ruby had many ties to both the Mafia and to Cuba, which were either unknown to the Warren Commission, or ignored by it.

The list of such items is almost endless.

In light of all of this, there is little wonder that very few people any longer have faith in the Warren Commission's conclusions that Oswald, and Oswald alone, was responsible for the death of President Kennedy, or that Ruby, likewise, was a "lone nut killer."

In a recent CBS poll, 65 percent of those polled said they did not believe the Warren Commission's conclusions. In a Detroit News poll, it was 87 percent. In addition, most of our leading newspapers and journals now have called for a reopening of the case.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns only assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King. If and when the select committee reaches a conclusion that other cases should be reexamined in depth, it will have authority to conduct such investigations.

However, for the present, the committee's efforts will be concentrated on the deaths of these two national leaders.

It is my hope and my expectation that this select committee shall be nonpartisan, and nonpolitical. It will be dealing with matters of grave concern to all Americans, regardless of their political party, race, or section of the country. I can foresee no partisan aspect to the work of the committee. And to the extent that I am privileged to participate in its work, I shall do everything in my power to see that it remains above politics.

This committee will engage in no witch hunts. Its purpose is to arrive at the truth, not to blame those who may have erred in the original investigations.

For my part, the only conclusion I have

reached concerning the murders of President Kennedy or Dr. King is that we do not know the complete truth. Certainly in the case of President Kennedy, I am convinced that there was a conspirator involved. I do not, however, know the identity of the conspirators or their motives. It is this that we must prove in depth.

So that there will be no question about the nonpolitical nature of the proposed committee, it has been agreed that there will be no public hearings held prior to the election in November. Some hearings may be scheduled for later this year, but most of the time will be spent in organizing staff, setting priorities, and obtaining a mass of official records. This will set the stage for prompt and deliberate action by the select committee when, as I strongly urge and expect, it will be re-established in the 95th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of us remembers the manner in which we heard of the assassinations of President Kennedy and of Dr. King. We may forget many of the details of our lives, but each one of us will always remember where we were, what we were doing, how we heard about these assassinations, and our own personal reaction to them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go home and face my people unless I can assure them that I have done by utmost to provide them with the knowledge of what really happened to John F. Kennedy, their President. I want them to know what happened to Dr. King. I want to be able to tell them that no one has stood in their way of learning the truth. I want to help restore in them the credibility of their Government. That they need.

I want to leave this as my legacy to the Members of the 95th Congress, the pleasure of whose country I have chosen, with great reluctance, to deny myself.

INTERROGATION OF LEE HARVEY OSWALD

Lee Harvey Oswald was questioned by Dallas police and by seven FBI officials for approximately 12 hours. There are no stenographic transcripts of his interrogation. No tape recorded record of the questioning was made. Capt. Will Fritz, chief of homicide, "kept no notes." The sole source of information about the interrogations are reports, based in large part on memory, prepared by some of those present and covering some of the interrogation sessions. There are no reports for several of the interrogation sessions on Friday afternoon. No transcripts were made of Oswald's arraignments for either of the two homicides with which he was charged.

Oswald was taken into custody at approximately 2 p.m. on Friday and was murdered in the basement of the Dallas Police and Courts Building on Sunday shortly after 11 a.m. Throughout his detention, Oswald was without legal representation.

On Friday evening representatives from the Dallas Civil Liberties Union appeared at the police department to determine whether Oswald was being deprived of counsel and they were told by police officials that Oswald was informed of his rights and free to seek a lawyer. They sought permission to meet

04417

with Oswald but were unable to meet with him.

The fact that the 12 hours of interrogation by FBI agents of Lee Harvey Oswald, perhaps the most important defendant and witness in the history of our country, are lost to us forever, raises the most serious questions: What did Oswald say? Why are we unable to learn his comments? Only a congressional committee that asks those questions of the seven FBI agents can provide answers for America.

BURNED AUTOPSY MATERIAL

There is general agreement that an analysis of the preliminary autopsy materials would shed further light on the possibilities of the Commission's "single bullet" theory, a theory which is crucial to the Commission's conclusion that Oswald was the lone assassin. However, chief autopsy surgeon, Comdr. James J. Humes, burned "preliminary draft notes" relating to the autopsy upon the body of President Kennedy. When Humes testified before the Warren Commission on March 16, 1964, he testified that:

In the privacy of my own home, early in the morning of Sunday, November 24, I made a draft of this report which I later revised, and of which this (handwritten report of autopsy report) represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room.

Commission Counsel Arlen Specter, author of the "single bullet" theory, did not ask Humes why he destroyed a crucial piece of Federal evidence in the case against Oswald.

JACK RUBY AND THE FBI

According to Commission Document 1052 Jack Ruby worked for the FBI as an informant on organized crime in Dallas from March 11, 1959, to October 2, 1959. During that time he was contacted on nine separate occasions by Dallas FBI Special Agent Charles W. Flynn. J. Lee Rankin, general counsel for the Warren Commission received this information by courier service from J. Edgar Hoover on June 9, 1964.

Leon D. Hubert, Jr., and Bert W. Griffin, the two Commission lawyers in charge of investigating Ruby's background were not provided any information on his underworld or law enforcement affiliations. Thus the Warren Commission did not know and did not reveal the relationship between Jack Ruby and the FBI.

ROBERT R. McKEOWN AND JACK RUBY

In 1959, while Jack Ruby was an informant for the FBI, he went to Havana, Cuba, where he stayed at the Tropicana Hotel owned by Meyer Lansky, a king pin in organized crime. Before Ruby went to Cuba he attempted to secure a letter of introduction to Fidel Castro from Robert R. McKeown. According to the statement of McKeown, Ruby offered \$25,000 for the letter of introduction to Castro.

The year was 1959—the year organized crime entered into an alliance with the intelligence community to assassinate Fidel Castro. The two Warren Commission lawyers assigned to investigate Jack Ruby's background, Leon D. Hubert, Jr., the former district attorney of New Or-

leans, and Bert Griffin, now a judge in Cleveland, Ohio, insisted in four separate memorandums that the Commission call McKeown as a witness. The Commission did not call McKeown and did not ask Ruby any questions about the matter.

POSSIBLE OSWALD LINK TO CIA

Before Oswald went to Mexico in September of 1963, he had to get an entry permit from the Mexican Consulate in New Orleans. After the assassination, the FBI investigated everyone who had gotten permits in New Orleans on the same day as Oswald. To their horror, they discovered that the man immediately preceding Oswald was one William George Gaudet, a man who had worked for the CIA since its founding in 1947. After much discussion between the CIA, the FBI, and the Warren Commission, it was decided not to call Gaudet as a witness, nor even to let his identity be known until the year 2039. However, recently, and apparently by accident, Gaudet's name was made public, and he has affirmed the story of the entry permit and the coverup.

This coverup by itself is bad enough, but it becomes more sinister when one realizes that CIA-man Gaudet not only stood in line ahead of Oswald, he also had knowledge of Ruby's activities. In fact, Gaudet told the FBI on November 27, 1963—4 days after the murder—of Ruby's activities in New Orleans.

Yet to this day, Gaudet has never been subpoenaed, put under oath and questioned publicly about the links between himself, Oswald, and Ruby—and the CIA.

THE WARREN COMMISSION'S SECRET MEETING

Two documents recently declassified, the January 22, 1964, and the January 27, 1964, transcripts of the Warren Commission executive sessions, provide interesting reading.

The members of the Commission decided to destroy the minutes of the meetings so that the American people might not know what the Commission discussed. The minutes survived, and they reveal that the general counsel for the Warren Commission, J. Lee Rankin, reported that the two highest law enforcement officials in Texas, Waggoner Carr, the attorney general of Texas, and Henry Wade, the Dallas district attorney, both had proof that Lee Harvey Oswald was an employee of the FBI. Rankin suggested that an examination of the FBI records would reveal that Oswald worked for the FBI, but he added that Hoover would probably deny that Oswald was the agent referred to in the FBI files. Allan Dulles assured Chief Justice Warren that Hoover would not tell the Commission the truth, even under oath, if Oswald did work for the FBI. Dulles said that a good agent would lie under similar circumstances.

The Commission agreed to call the five relevant witnesses on the questioning of Oswald's employment by the FBI and to subpoena Oswald's FBI file as well. By the end of the second meeting, the Commission decided not to call the five relevant witnesses and not to subpoena the records of the FBI. Instead, the Warren Com-

mission relied exclusively upon the testimony of Mr. Hoover regarding Oswald's association with the FBI.

Yet for many Americans this question remains an open one. A question which must be resolved if we are to know how and why John Kennedy was assassinated.

TAPED CONVERSATION OF "OSWALD" IN MEXICO CITY

When Oswald visited Mexico City in September 1963, someone made several visits and phone calls to the Soviet and Cuban Embassies using the Oswald identity.

That there is some doubt that the person visiting and phoning the embassies was in fact Lee Harvey Oswald is evidenced by the fact that many photographs of "Oswald" were taken by CIA cameras outside both embassies. Each and every photograph which has been pruned loose from the Government—and they are still withholding some—are of a man who is about 6 feet 2 inches, 175 pounds, 35 years old, and burly. "Our" Oswald was 5 feet 9 inches, 135 pounds, 24 years old, and slim. The pictures are obviously not of Oswald, though so identified by the CIA.

At the same time, the CIA—through some unknown means—tapped and taped the telephone calls of "Oswald" to the Soviet and/or Cuban Embassies. These recorded conversations were withheld from the Warren Commission. Had they been made available, or if they were made available today, voice prints of them could be made and compared with voice prints of known conversations of Lee Oswald. Then we would know for sure if there was someone else using Oswald's identity in Mexico City. And, if there are two Oswalds for sure, we can wager great odds that there was a conspiracy involved in the death of our President.

SECRET WIRETAPS

After the assassination, the Federal Government placed a number of wiretaps but withheld most of the "fruits" of these taps from the Warren Commission.

We are certain as to one crucial tap because of an FBI report declassified only weeks ago. This tap was either on the home phone of the Paine residence or the business phone of Michael Paine. It must be remembered that the Paines were the Oswald's closest friends in Dallas; in fact, Marina Oswald was living at the Paine residence at the time of the assassination. Oswald ostensibly stored his rifle in the Paine's garage.

On the day after the assassination, the FBI overheard Ruth and Michael Paine telling each other over the telephone that, although Oswald did the shooting, "We know who is responsible." Apparently the tapes from the conversation were withheld, because when the Paines were questioned at a later date, they denied the fact that the conversation had taken place. The FBI dropped the subject without ever facing them with a tape or an FBI agent who had monitored the conversation.

If the Oswalds' best friends, the Paines, know "who was responsible," is it not about time that the American people know?

ALLAN DULLES AND ASSASSINATIONS

A leading member of the Warren Commission was Allan Dulles. Mr. Dulles had been the Director of the CIA from 1953 until after the Bay of Pigs in 1961. During this time, Dulles, as the head of the CIA, must have been privy to the fact that the CIA had been actively engaged in many attempts to murder Fidel Castro in the years 1959-61.

The grimy details of the CIA excesses—especially the use made by the CIA of the Mafia in its murder plots—have been recently documented by the Church committee.

Yet, despite the Warren Commission's great interest in Oswald's many links to Cuba and to both pro-Fidel and anti-Fidel factions, Allan Dulles never said one word to the other members of the Commission about the attempts on the life of Castro. Had Allan Dulles been more forthcoming, the whole direction of the Warren investigation might have been radically different and its conclusions radically altered.

When we have a new investigation of the Dallas murder—and we will have one, whether it is this year, next year, or 10 years hence—the investigators can now realistically weigh the evidence withheld from Earl Warren by Allan Dulles to see if John Kennedy's death was directly or indirectly caused by his administration's attempts on the life of Fidel Castro.

THE MURDER WEAPON

A rifle was discovered on the sixth floor of the book depository building at 1:22 p.m. on November 22, 1963. The Dallas authorities told the press later that day that the weapon was a 7.65 German Mauser. Dallas District Attorney Wade repeated this information at a formal televised press conference and it was widely publicized. Deputy Constable Seymour Weitzman, on November 23, 1963, in a notarized affidavit, described the rifle he and Deputy Sheriff Boone found as "a 7.65 Mauser, bolt action equipped with a 4/18 scope, a thick leather brownish black sling on it." In a filmed interview in April 1974, Roger Craig, a deputy Sheriff also present when the rifle was found stated:

I was standing next to Weitzman, he was standing next to Fritz, and we weren't any more than six or eight inches from the rifle and stopped right at the door.

would have made such a case of mistaken identification.

Recently declassified CIA documents add further evidence that "Oswald's" rifle was not the rifle found in the book depository. A CIA report, dated November 23, 1963, states: *

On November 22, 1963 Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy while the President was riding in an open automobile on a Dallas Texas street. The rifle used was a Mauser. . .

A second CIA report dated 5 days after the assassination states: **

November 28, 1963.

INFORMATION ON THE WEAPON PRESUMABLY USED IN THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

1. As regards articles appearing recently in the Italian and foreign press concerning the presumed use of an Italian-made rifle in the slaying of President Kennedy, the following comments are made.

2. The weapon which appears to have been employed in this criminal attack is a model 91 rifle, 7.35 caliber, 1938 modification.

3. The description of a "Mannlicher Carcano" rifle in the Italian and foreign press is in error.

It should be clear that the initial identification of the rifle as a 7.65 Mauser clearly was not, as the Commission maintained, because Deputy Constable Weitzman "thought it looked like a Mauser." Since the Commission's case against Oswald as the lone assassin is built almost exclusively on his ownership of the 6.5 Mannlicher/Carcano, the identification of the murder weapon as 7.65 Mauser tends to discredit the entire case.

The report of the Warren Commission includes reference to a trip by Lee Harvey Oswald to Mexico City in late September of 1963, where on September 28 he visited both the Cuban and the Soviet Embassies. The report mentions that while he was in the Soviet Embassy he spoke with the Soviet Consul Kostikov, who also served as a KGB agent. Oswald referred to him as "Comrad Kostin." There is no further reference in the Warren Commission report as to the identity of Kostikov. We learned this in the recent release of some 1,500 CIA documents. I quote from one of the documents:

Note.—Valeriy Vladimirovich Kostikov, who has functioned overtly as a consul in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City since

a staff
ed with
rtment,
sination

- * Blind Memorandum dated 25 November 1963 [original undated] - information on OSWALD passed to Mexican Government. [NB: According to original - Win SCOTT read information to Mexican President on night of 25 November 1963.] [Document number 103-42]

- ** OIRA 35972, 31 December 1963 [Document number 448-175]

as were
e have
be the
visiting
bilities,
assina-
ly sus-
ld like
B con-
this is
report.

nce in
do so

w that
n, Os-

wald hand-delivered to the FBI office in Dallas a threatening letter addressed to FBI Agent James Hosty. Two hours after Ruby shot Oswald, Hosty tore up the note and a memorandum about it, and flushed them down a toilet in the FBI office.

How can we be so sure of the details of this incident? Because a subcommittee of the House, chaired by the Honorable Don Edwards, held a full-fledged hearing under oath on this subject not more than a few months ago. Such facts as I have stated are perfectly clear.

What is not clear is: First, the nature of the threats in the letter; second, did J. Edgar Hoover know of the letter; third, who ordered the letter destroyed; and fourth, why was it so crucial to hide the whole incident from the Warren Commission?

At the Edwards hearing, the testimony of various FBI witnesses was radically contradictory. As they were under oath, at least some of the witnesses were perjuring themselves, 12 years after the fact.

The aim of the FBI appeared obvious from Hosty's answers to questions from Chairman Edwards. He said he did not tell the Commission about the Oswald letter because he was not asked. He did not volunteer the information because he had been instructed not to volunteer anything that would be of help to the Commission.

To the extent I am privileged to participate in its work I shall do everything in my power to see that the committee remains above politics.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia, I would like to pledge to the gentleman or others my cooperation and work with the staff on how to set up the committee. I also commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for his initial leadership in this area. I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that you have a small staff and use other Government agencies to help gather information.

Also I would like to suggest that these select committees do not have to run on and on. Even though the Select Committee on Missing Persons was extended for 3 months over the 1 year of the life of the committee, which was needed, I think we can write a comprehensive report on the missing persons by January 3. I see no reason to extend the Select Committee on Missing Persons.

I know the gentleman will look into these matters.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I agree with him. The life of the committee will be determined by each succeeding Congress.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this

Document Contradicts Testimony

CIA Viewed Oswald
As Information Source

Associated Press

Contrary to sworn testimony, the CIA once considered using presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald as a source of intelligence information about the Soviet Union, according to a newly released CIA document.

In sworn testimony before the Warren Commission, Richard Helms, then a branch chief and later the CIA's director, said the agency never had "or even contemplated" any contacts with Oswald.

The newly released document, written by an unidentified CIA officer three days after President John F. Kennedy was killed in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963, says that "we showed intelligence interest" in Oswald and "discussed . . . the laying on of interviews."

The unidentified officer added that "I do not know what action developed thereafter."

THE MEMO WAS AMONG hundreds of pages of documents from the CIA's file on Lee Harvey Oswald. The material was released to The Associated Press yesterday under the Freedom of Information Act.

A second document reveals that former CIA Director Allen Dulles, while serving as a member of the Warren Commission, privately counseled CIA officials on the best way to answer questions from the commission about allegations that Oswald was a CIA agent.

Dulles "thought language which made it clear that Lee Harvey Oswald was never an employee or agent of CIA would suffice," an unidentified CIA officer wrote Helms in April 1964.

"I agree with him that a carefully phrased denial of the charges of involvement with Oswald seemed most appropriate," the unidentified officer added.

When he appeared before the commission in May 1964, Helms, then head of the agency's clandestine services, testified under oath that "there's no material in the Central Intelligence Agency, either in the records or in the mind of any of the individuals that there was any con-

tact had or even contemplated with" Oswald.

THE NOV. 25, 1963, memo explains that the agency's interest in Oswald as a potential intelligence source was due to his "unusual behavior in the USSR," to which he had defected in 1959.

"We were particularly interested in the (deleted) Oswald might provide on the Minsk factory in which he had been employed, on certain sections of the city itself, and of course we thought the usual (deleted) that might help develop (deleted) personality dossiers," the memo states.

The memo indicates that Oswald was also of interest to the CIA because of concern that his Russian-born wife, Marina, might have been part of a trend for Soviet women to marry foreigners, leave the country and settle overseas where they could serve as spies.

THE MEMO ABOUT the agency's interest in Oswald said the discussions about Oswald occurred "some time in summer 1960." The author continued: "I don't recall if this was discussed while Oswald and his family were en route to our country or if it was after their arrival."

04418